

233 South Wacker Drive Suite 800, Sears Tower Chicago, IL 60606

312-454-0400 (voice) 312-454-0411 (fax) www.cmap.illinois.gov

CMAP Land Use Committee Meeting Notes

Wednesday, February 20, 2008

Offices of the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP)

Cook County Conference Room

Suite 800, 233 S. Wacker Drive, Sears Tower, Chicago, Illinois

Members Present: Mark Avery (chair), Judy Beck, Alan Bennett, Jerry Conrad, Roger Dahlstrom, Michael Davidson, David Dubois, David Galowich, Tam Kutzmark (for Ken Johnson), Jim LaBelle, Ed Paesel (vice-chair), James Peters, Dennis Sandquist, Heather Smith, Karen Stonehouse, Heather Tabbert, Kai Tarum

Members Absent: Sam Assefa, Keith Eichorst, Nancy Williamson, Norm West, Mark Ruby, Jackie Tredup

CMAP Staff Present: Erin Aleman, Bob Dean, Don Kopek, Jill Leary, Stephen Ostrander, Gordon Smith, Clifton Tremble, Ty Warner (committee staff liaison)

Others Present: Mark Angelini, S.B. Friedman & Co.; Christopher Staron, Northwest Municipal Conference; Mike Walczak, Northwest Municipal Conference

1.0 Call to Order and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 9:07 a.m.

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

There were no agenda changes.

3.0 Approval of Meeting Notes – January 16th, 2008

A motion to approve the minutes of the January 16 meeting, as corrected by Roger Dahlstrom, was made by Ed Paesel and seconded by Alan Bennett. All in favor the motion carried.

4.0 Legislative Update

Mark Avery mentioned several trailer bills to HB 656. Rep. Franks from McHenry had introduced a trailer that would require each of the County Boards to andorse the language in the bill, but this is not likely to go further. Rep. Rigg from Lake introduced a trailer to require each of the counties to provide financial accounting of how they spend their quarter of a percent sales tax. Lastly, there has been discussion on what is taxed and what

is exempt. Regarding a capital bill, the RTA and others have been working to have one that the state can afford to fund higher than the \$3 billion talked about in the past.

Jim LaBelle stated they have low expectations for legislative action this Spring, and that the capital bill has been tied up with gaming. He stated the Rigg bill pased the House, limiting the provision for free rides for seniors and adding free rides in certain instances for the disabled. Rep. Hoffman's legislation to add two members to the CMAP Board back is back in play, and requires that they must reside in the region.

Earmarks in SAFETEA-LU are often just a small portion of the total costs of projects, for planning and a little engineering but no construction. There is not enough money for matching Federal funds, much less actual construction. The Highway Fund is losing money, and the gas tax is not keeping up.

5.0 Regional Comprehensive Plan

5.1 Snapshot Report: Jobs-Housing Balance:

Bob Dean presented for project manager Lee Deuben on the Jobs-Housing Balance Snapshot. This snapshot's focus is on figuring out where CMAP should focus strategies on for affordable housing and job creation then we will focus on how to improve transit. There are three typologies to this report: Housing Rich, Balanced and Job Rich. Next CMAP will be exploring how to incorporate the use of the LEHD data into this report.

The Committee discussed the fact that the maps don't include I-355; what kinds of jobs were looked at in the maps – high income vs. low income; is CMAP planning to relate this work to the local municipal zoning work that Fregonese and Associates is doing.

Both David Galowich and Ed Paesel noted that it is important to create jobs by affordable housing, otherwise you are swimming upstream. Alan Bennett noted it is less arduous to provide more convenient transit to get to job rich areas in the most efficient way (ex. Cook-DuPage corridor study).

Mark Avery noted that CMAP should coordinate this work with the work the Metropolitan Mayor's Caucus has done.

Heather Smith asked to what extent telecommuting is accounted for?

Roger Dalhstrom asked if CMAP had looked into Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) programs.

Jim LaBelle noted that by enabling more people to live near transit the more we can mitigate the disconnect.

Dennis Sandquist noted that we should dig a little deeper into the commuter time issue looking at it by mode choice and by income.

Ed Paesel brought up the fact that we should also include the impacts on families, what are the social impacts, more daycare for kids, less time for parents to spend with kids do to commute times.

Mark Avery noted that encouraging affordability at TOD centers would make a big difference.

5.2 Indicators Development Scenario construction and evaluation:

Example:

Envision Utah

4 scenarios generated through chosen indicators

Will be receiving help with indicator work from Chicago Community Trust

- A model is the Boston Indicators Project. Dean went through sections of the website (http://www.bostonindicators.org/IndicatorsProject/) to provide examples.
- Dean noted that Chicago Community Trust will help CMAP create interactive website, which will allow visitors to "drill down" to detailed data.
- Jim LaBelle asked whether content from the RTAMS site (http://www.rtams.org/ui/homepage.asp). Dean said that was his expectation.

Dean mentioned that CMAP is also hiring a consultant to assist with data analysis for the indicators.

Judy Beck asked about models to be used for scenario development. (Dean responded that some existing transportation models would be utilized). Beck suggested looking at the "State of the Lakes" reports (http://www.epa.gov/greatlakes/solec/index.html), in which the Great Lakes National Program Office and its partners collected every relevant indicator that they could think of before narrowing down to key ones. Dennis Sandquist seconded that SOLA's reports are easy to understand and effective.

5.3 Strategy Research

Dean gave sneak preview of the "Go to 2040" website being developed for the Regional Comprehensive Plan.

 One of the first things CMAP will be posting on the new website will be a series of "white papers" on the strategy research being done in support of the Regional Comprehensive Plan. CMAP wants to get feedback on these white papers, which will be posted in a blog-like format, which will offer readers the opportunity to post comments (which will go live on the website after basic review). This content will be geared toward planners, public officials, and other professionals. Dean asked the Land Use Committee for feedback on how to make the website more attractive and engaging.

Tam Kutzmark asked what is CMAP's goal for this white paper feedback. Dean answered that the primary goal is to receive more information, especially regarding best practices and ideas relevant to each white paper topic. This feedback may help to inform revisions to these white papers themselves.

David Galowich commented that the most important thing is how to reach out into the public—i.e. the "mainstream"—not just professionals. Dean asked Galowich if he could assist CMAP with this (to which Galowich said he'd be glad to).

Ed Paesel asked if relevant papers from other agencies and organizations might also be posted alongside CMAP's own white papers. Dean answered that there is a possibility of linking to such outside research, but there are no plans to post them on the "Go to 2040" website, because CMAP wouldn't want their conclusions to be mistaken for CMAP's.

Karen Stonehouse agreed that there is a need for CMAP to clarify the purpose of the white papers section of the website so that it doesn't become a "dumping ground," especially for negative commentary.

When asked about the topical range of the white papers, Dean answered that about 50 topics will be addressed.

Kai Tarum asked whether a simple "are you ok with this?" feedback question might be sufficient for essential feedback (because many people don't have time to offer extensive feedback).

Roger Dahlstrom (and others) asked for clarification on how topics were chosen. Dean said he would forward a list of chosen topics.

Alan Bennett suggested that at its next meeting the Land Use Committee be given the opportunity to comment on—and possibly add—topics to be covered.

Kutzmark suggested that there be clear information on the "Go to 2040" website homepage explaining where this opportunity for public participation (i.e. white paper feedback) fits in (in reference to other opportunities for public involvement and comment).

6.0 Committee Charge

Mark Avery thanked Kutzmark and Bennett for their feedback to the draft Committee Charge.

Dahlstrom suggested adding "growth management" to the "Vision" section of the Committee Charge.

Galowich warned that "growth management" is a term that could be a
 "lightning rod" to some. He and other members of the Committee
 suggested that some "wordsmithing" may be necessary. Avery noted that
 Kutzmark suggested adding the word "development," which may cover
 this concern.

Michael Davidson asked about the "Support regional collaboration and partnerships that benefits all stakeholders" phrase in the second bullet point under the "Vision" section, wondering whether it reflects the realities of land use planning.

Beck and Galowich questioned whether "Vision" was the best word for the first section of the Committee Charge (Galowich asked about whether "Mission" was a more apt word to use).

Paesel suggested that more specificity is needed to explain the Land Use Committee's work, especially its interaction with CMAP staff, etc. He said that perhaps the Committee's role needs to be better defined by the Programming Committee and the Board. (Many members of the Committee agreed with Paesel that some clarification is needed.)

In closing, Avery said that he would "take another crack" at the Committee Charge and distribute to the members of the Committee.

7.0 Developments of Regional Importance

Avery noted that the draft DRI document under discussion is available on CMAP's website under the Programming Committee section. (Responding to requests, it was agreed that Avery or Ty Warner would send out the document by email to Committee members).

Avery explained that the subcommittee working on the document met in late January and early February. There was consensus that some modification was needed. Another meeting for the DRI Programming Subcommittee is scheduled for Wednesday, March 5 from 3 - 4:30pm. Don Kopec encouraged anyone to get comments to him in advance of this meeting. Ty Warner reminded Committee members that the subcommittee is expecting to revise the DRI document. Jill Leary noted that this will not be the only opportunity for comment.

Jim LaBelle suggested that the DRI document should also address "community-to-community" roles and responsibilities, in addition to CMAP's, and said he felt that one of the primary benefits of the bill was what he called the "good neighbor" provision requiring notification to neighbors about the projects which could affect them, and that this is important to transparency.

Dennis Sandquist also felt that notification was the major benefit of the legislation from Lake County's perspective.

Kopec underscored that this first document will focus on the basic question "What is a DRI?"

David Dubois and Ed Paesel both cautioned about overlapping jurisdictional reviews.

Michael Davidson asked about whether CMAP was considering certain DRI processes as models, such as Georgia's efforts. Kopec answered that Georgia and Florida were thought to be good examples to consider, but were not necessarily models to be followed strictly.

In response to a question, both Kopec and Leary confirmed that the DRI process is not regulatory.

Jerry Conrad said that he felt competition was a benefit, not just in the market but among municipalities as well, and is concerned about the extent of revealing development plans in a competitive marketplace.

8.0 Next meeting

The next meeting of the Land Use Committee is scheduled for March 19, 2008.

9.0 Other Business

David Galowich announced that the Urban Land Institute Chicago District Council has hired its first Executive Director in Curt Wiley, who was previously Director at Fannie Mae 1999-2007, Commissioner of the Indiana Department of Transportation 1996-1999, Executive Director of the Indiana Department of Commerce 1992-1996, and before that was an Executive Assistant to the Indiana Governor and Deputy Director of the Michigan Department of Transportation. Mr. Wiley began with ULI on February 11th.

10.0 Public Comment

There were no public comments.

11.0 Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting of the Land Use Committee is March 19th, 2008.

12.0 Adjournment

A motion to adjourn made by Avery was seconded by Paesel. All in favor the motion carried at 11:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ty Warner, Committee Liaison